

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 21 October 2004. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1 – 20 have been amended to clarify the language thereof.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 2, 11 and 14 due to informalities therein. Additionally, Claims 2 – 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 – 20 have been amended to correct the language thereof. It is believed that the antecedent basis problems of the original claims has been corrected and the terminology clarified. Thus, it is now believed that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 14, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman, U.S. Patent No. 6,725,399.

It is respectfully submitted that the Bowman reference is directed to a method for testing computer software to determine if it meets the user requirements.

Whereas the invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to a user interface for a system that develops circuit board test programs. Thus, the display of the main menu includes defining a footing of objects to be tested, which is directed to the actual shape of the circuit board being tested. Further, the main menu includes building intercepted data of coordinates of positions of parts, representing the identification of the coordinate positions of the electronic components on the circuit board. Nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest identifying the coordinates of positions of any physical structures. It is believed that the Examiner has misinterpreted these two elements of the main menu.

As the reference fails to disclose each and every one of the elements of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as defined in Claim 1, it cannot anticipate that invention. Further, as the reference fails to suggest the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application, and in fact teaches away from the invention of the subject Patent Application, as it is not directed to defining a user interface for the development of the circuit board testing program, it cannot make obvious that invention either. It is believed that the dependent claims each provide further patentably distinct limitations, but are at least patentably distinct for the same reasons as Claim 1, and therefore should also be allowable.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein  
Registration #33,253

Dated: 21 Feb. 2005

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee  
Suite 101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.  
04586